



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/706,435	11/03/2000	Ronald Schauer	4448/IBSS/DV	6410
32588	7590	03/24/2004	EXAMINER	
APPLIED MATERIALS, INC. 2881 SCOTT BLVD. M/S 2061 SANTA CLARA, CA 95050			MORRISON, NASCHICA SANDERS	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3632	
DATE MAILED: 03/24/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/706,435

Applicant(s)

SCHAUER ET AL.

Examiner

Naschica S Morrison

Art Unit

3632

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10704</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This is the fourth Office Action for serial number 09/706,435, Installation docking pedestal for pre-facilitation of wafer fabrication equipment, filed on November 3, 2000. Claims 1-13 are pending.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/24/03 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter that the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 is rejected because it is unclear whether the combination of the support apparatus and the semiconductor manufacturing equipment is being claimed or merely the subcombination of the support apparatus. Claim 1 recites the semiconductor

manufacturing equipment in a functional statement in the preambles of the respective claims, indicating the subcombination is being claimed, yet the applicant recites a further structural limitation to the semiconductor manufacturing equipment in claim 1 (lines 9 & 17) indicating the combination is being claimed. Also, please see all depending claims for similar problems. For purposes of this Office action, the examiner will assume the **subcombination** is being claimed. If applicant's intent is to claim the subcombination, the following change to claim 1 is suggested: on line 9, insert --is adapted to-- before "substantially duplicates" and on line 17 insert --adapted to be-- before "pre-aligned".

Claim 3 is rejected because it is unclear whether the combination of the support apparatus and the waffle-grid floor is being claimed or merely the subcombination of the support apparatus. Claim 3 recites the support apparatus as being claimed in the preamble, indicating the subcombination is being claimed, yet the applicant recites a further structural limitation to the floor in claim 3 (line 3) indicating the combination is being claimed. Also, please see all depending claims for similar problems. For purposes of this Office action, the examiner will assume the **subcombination** is being claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 10, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,312,525 to Bright et al. (Bright) in view of Admitted Prior Art (APA) of

Art Unit: 3632

Fig. 1. Regarding claims 1, 4, 10, 11, Bright discloses a support apparatus (Fig. 2) comprising: a plurality of support legs (three tallest posts extending upwardly from 26); a non-rectangular, monolithic frame (26) disposed on the support legs and having an outline substantially duplicating the bottom outline of a manufacturing equipment (22, 16, 16); a facilities connection locator (members 34, 34) mounted to the support apparatus and providing a plurality of facilities connection locations that adapted to be pre-aligned to one or more vacuum lines on the manufacturing equipment (22, 16, 16). Bright does not teach the plurality of support legs being configured to align to a plurality of mounting feet of the manufacturing equipment. The APA of Fig. 1 discloses a support apparatus comprising a plurality of support legs (121) extending down to a base mount location pad (123) on a waffle-grid flooring (125) and aligned to each one of a plurality of load-bearing mounting feet of a manufacturing equipment (111). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have configured the frame of Bright so as to align the support legs of Bright with load-bearing mounting feet of a manufacturing equipment because one would have been motivated to provide direct support for the load bearing feet of the equipment in order to provide a more stable support apparatus as inherently taught by the APA of Fig. 1.

Regarding claim 5, Bright does not teach the frame being a steel frame; however, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have formed the frame from iron, steel, or various other metals since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice.

Claims 1-5 and 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art (APA) of Fig. 2 in view of Admitted Prior Art (APA) of Fig. 1, and further in view of Bright. With regards to claims 1-4, 7, 10, and 11, APA of Fig. 2 discloses a support apparatus comprising: a plurality of support legs (131) extending down to a base mount location disposed at an interstice (at 133) of a waffle-grid floor (125) and a monolithic frame (135) disposed on the plurality of support legs, the frame including a flange (located between 135 and 139) about the periphery thereof for supporting raised flooring (139) and facilities connection locators (137) providing pluralities of connection points for site facilities. APA of Fig. 2 does not disclose the support legs aligned to each one of a plurality of load-bearing mounting feet of equipment or the frame having an outline substantially duplicating the bottom outline of the equipment. APA of Fig. 1 discloses a support apparatus comprising a plurality of support legs (121) extending down to a base mount location pad (123) on a waffle-grid flooring (125) and aligned to each one of a plurality of load-bearing mounting feet of a manufacturing equipment (111). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the APA of Fig. 2 by aligning the support legs with the load-bearing mounting feet because one would have been motivated to provide direct support for the load bearing feet in order to provide a more stable support apparatus. APA of Fig. 2 in view of APA of Fig. 1 discloses the support apparatus as applied above, but does not disclose the frame of APA of Fig. 2 having a non-rectangular outline substantially duplicating the outline of the equipment or the facilities connection locations being adapted to be pre-aligned to one or more

Art Unit: 3632

facilities connection points (i.e. vacuum lines) of the manufacturing equipment. Bright discloses the support apparatus as applied to claims 1, 4, 5, 10, 11 above. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have contoured the frame outline to be a substantial duplicate of the equipment bottom outline and pre-aligned the facilities connection locations to those of the manufacturing equipment because one would have been motivated to reduce the amount of material necessary to manufacture the frame as well as reduce the amount of floor space occupied by the frame and equipment mounted thereon as taught by Bright.

Regarding claim 5, APA of Fig. 2 does not teach the frame being a molded steel frame; however, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have formed the frame of APA of Fig. 2 from iron, steel, or various other metals since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. Regarding claims 8 and 9, APA of Fig. 2 discloses flanges on the periphery of the frame for supporting raised flooring but does not teach the frame including flanges along the inner edges thereof. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have formed flanges on the inner edges of the frame of APA of Fig. 2 because one would have been motivated to provide a structural means for supporting raised flooring as inherently taught by APA of Fig. 2.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bright in view of APA of Fig. 1 and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,107,775 to Langlais et al.

Art Unit: 3632

(Langlais). With regards to claim 6, Bright in view of APA of Fig. 1 discloses the support apparatus as applied above, but does not teach the support legs of Bright having an adjustable length. Langlais discloses a support apparatus (10) comprising a plurality of support legs (12,14) having an adjustable length. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the support legs of Bright to be adjustable in length because one would have been motivated to provide a means for raising the platform as taught by Langlais (Abstract, lines 1-2).

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA of Fig. 2 in view of APA of Fig. 1 in view of Bright, and further in view of Langlais. With regards to claim 6, APA of Fig. 2 in view of APA of Fig. 1 in view of Bright discloses the support apparatus as applied above, but does not teach the support legs of APA of Fig. 2 having an adjustable length. Langlais discloses a support apparatus (10) comprising a plurality of support legs (12,14) having an adjustable length. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the support legs of APA of Fig. 2 to be adjustable in length because one would have been motivated to provide a means for raising the platform as taught by Langlais (Abstract, lines 1-2).

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA of Fig. 2 in view of APA of Fig. 1 in view of Bright, and further in view of U.S. Patent 4,480,656 to Johnson. With regards to claim 12, APA of Fig. 2 in view of APA of Fig. 1 in view of Bright discloses the support apparatus as applied above, but does not disclose gooseneck couplings attached to the connection points of APA of Fig. 2.

Art Unit: 3632

Johnson discloses a gooseneck coupling (34). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided gooseneck couplings at the facilities connection points of APA of Fig. 2 because one would have been motivated to provide a means for connecting the supply lines to the equipment as inherently taught by Johnson.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bright in view of APA of Fig. 1 and further in view of U.S. Patent 2,197,598 to Way. With regards to claim 13, Bright in view of APA of Fig. 1 discloses the support apparatus as applied above, but does not teach the frame of Bright including a plurality of seismic braces. Way discloses a support apparatus (Fig. 1) comprising a platform (10) having a plurality of braces (15,16) affixed to support legs (27) and adapted to fix to an object supported thereon. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the support apparatus of Bright to include braces because one would have been motivated to provide a device for securing and preventing shifting of objects mounted on the support frame as taught by Way.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA of Fig. 2 in view of APA of Fig. 1 in view of Bright, and further in view of Way. With regards to claim 13, APA of Fig. 2 in view of APA of Fig. 1 in view of Bright discloses the support apparatus as applied above, but does not teach the frame of APA of Fig. 2 including a plurality of seismic braces. Way discloses a support apparatus (Fig. 1) comprising a platform (10) having a plurality of braces (15,16) affixed to support legs (27) and adapted to fix to an object supported thereon. It would have been obvious to one of

Art Unit: 3632

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the support apparatus of APA of Fig. 2 to include braces because one would have been motivated to provide a device for securing and preventing shifting of objects mounted on the support frame as taught by Way.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Applicant's arguments filed 11/24/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding applicant's argument that Bright shows a modular vacuum system and does not teach a plurality of load bearing mounting feet positioned below the platform 26, examiner has reviewed the Bright reference and believes it to teach the claim limitations recited since the equipment of Bright is considered to be members 22, 16, and 16 which are supported by the frame 26 which has three upwardly extending feet (tallest posts extending upwardly from 26) on which the equipment rests and further since the outline of the frame substantially duplicates the outline of the equipment (22,16,16).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Naschica S. Morrison, whose telephone number is (703) 305-0228. If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's

Art Unit: 3632

supervisor, Leslie Braun can be reached at 703-308-2156. The fax machine telephone number for the Technology Center is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this Application should be directed to the Technology Center receptionist at (703) 872-9325.



Naschica S. Morrison

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 3632

3/19/04



LESLIE A. BRAUN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER